AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement drawing sheets makes changes to Figs. 10, 11, 24, 25, and 36 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 10, 11, 24, 25, and 36.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, Figs. 10, 11, 24, 25, and 36 are amended, the specification is amended, and claims 1-12 are amended.

Objections to the Drawings

The Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) objects to the drawings, the Examiner asserting that there are spelling errors in at least Figs. 25 and 36. Figs. 10, 11, 24, 25, and 36 are amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Abstract

The PTO objects to the abstract of the disclosure based upon spelling errors. The objection is obviated by amendments to the abstract that corrects the spelling of the word "paste," and makes other typographical changes. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

Applicants take notice of the indication that the specification has not been checked for the presence of minor errors. Notwithstanding the absence of a specific objection to the specification, Applicants will correct any errors Applicants become aware of.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The PTO rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §101, asserting that the claims is directed to software, *per se*, a non-statutory subject matter. Claim 12 is rewritten in independent form, reciting a computer-readable medium in proper Beauregard format. The recited computer-readable medium is supported by page 41 of the written description, fourth paragraph, and Fig. 37, which discloses a recording medium 1600 storing a program embodying the recited method.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ed Bott, "Using Microsoft Office 2000," 1999 by Que, pages 349-351 and 380-382, in view of one or more of Rawat (US 6,662,340), Nguyen (US 5,544,302), James (US 7,036,080), Bauchot (US 20020007380), Terasawa (JP 05298003), and Takatsuka (US 20020156615). These rejections are respectfully traversed based upon the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

At the outset, the combination of Bott and Rawat, and in the alterative, the combination of Bott and Nguyen, taken as a whole, do not suggest Applicants' claimed information processing method. Furthermore, the asserted combinations do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method of information processing comprising copying plural objects, wherein the copying comprises:

> "analyzing a logical structure of a copy source information;
>
> recognizing an object that corresponds to a predetermined copy area of plural objects included in the copy source information;
>
> selecting the plural objects that belong to an upper object of the recognized object;
>
> extracting a partial copy source information corresponding to the selected plural objects;
>
> performing a semantic analysis on objects within the extracted partial copy source information; and
>
> specifying semantic attributes of the objects analyzed...."

Claim 1 further recites selecting paste targets, wherein the selecting comprises:

> "analyzing a logical structure of a paste target source information;
>
> recognizing an object corresponding to a user specified paste area selected from a plurality of objects within the paste target source information;
>
> selecting a plurality of objects belonging to an upper object of the recognized object;

extracting a partial paste target source information corresponding to the selected plurality of objects;

performing a semantic analysis on objects included in the extracted partial paste target source information; and

specifying semantic attributes of the analyzed objects included in the extracted partial paste target source information..."

Bott appears to only disclose copying and pasting selected objects with a structural association such as "Formats" or "Values" from the copy module. However, the choices allowable to the user are predefined, and therefore the association must be predefined.

Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges that Bott fails to disclose performing a semantic analysis and selecting paste targets which match the results of the semantic analysis. The Examiner relies upon either Rawat or Nguyen to remedy the deficiencies of Bott as regarding claim 1. Based upon the amendments to claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Rawat appears to only disclose a client side program that examines electronic documents such as web pages and automatically fills out fields of forms contained in the document with the appropriate data from a user profile. Because the data to be copied comes from the user profile, the copied data is already analyzed. In other words, Rawat appears to disclose selecting information to be inputted into fields from a source of information based solely on a semantic analysis of the target fields. No analysis of source data is required, and indeed, nowhere does Rawat appear to disclose analyzing the source of information.

Therefore, claim 1 is distinguished from Bott and Rawat in that the data being copied is unknown data that first must be processed by a method that includes analyzing, recognizing, extracting, and performing a semantic analysis on plural objects extracted from the data. Based upon the copying method, the recited method teaches selecting plural objects placed at the same or lower level with an object specified by indication from a user after analyzing a structure of source information. Accordingly, the method enables the selection of objects to be pasted together from source information having several structures.Furthermore, nowhere does Rawat appear to disclose selecting an association of plural fields, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Rawat appears to only be capable of "repeating selecting one target field," or "selecting all target fields."

Furthermore, Rawat appears to only disclose semantic analysis based upon analyzing text expressions that occur within predetermined distances, i.e., physical distances, of the field. Nowhere does Rawat appear to disclose wherein the distance is "semantic distance," as disclosed by the instant invention. Therefore if there is no any copy source information that has the same semantic attribute as the semantic attribute of target for pasting, Rawat would appear incapable of execute pasting as disclosed by Applicants.

Applicants' disclosed invention, on the other hand, achieves copying and pasting between objects having similar semantic attributes based upon a thesaurus, thereby providing copying and pasting flexibility, (*see* claim 2).

Regarding Nguyen, Applicants respectfully submit that not only does Nguyen fail to disclose the features of amended claim 1, the combination of Bott and Nguyen is improper, and appears to be based on hindsight reasoning. Nguyen appears to only disclose an object-oriented framework used to create container objects which are, in turn, used to hold both other objects and information, (*see* abstract). More specifically, the framework contains "a set of pre-defined class information which allows container objects to be constructed or instantiated." (See abstract, emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bott nor Nguyen suggest the desirability of combining their respective teachings. It is improper to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. The Office Action appears to use improper hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is improper.

Regarding the computer-readable medium recited in amended claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that Terasawa likewise fails to remedy the deficiencies of Bott and Rawat, as identified above. Therefore the rejection of claim 12 is improper.

Independent claim 13, rejected over Bott and Rawat, recites an information processing apparatus that includes a semantic analysis performing unit that performs a semantic analysis of each of the copied plural objects. As presented above in regards to claim 1, neither Bott nor Rawat

discloses, teaches, or suggests semantic analysis on copied data.

Based upon the above, Applicants respectfully submit the asserted combinations of references present no apparent reason to combine the references or modify prior art to create the Applicants' allegedly obvious claim elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the asserted combination of references. Claims 2-11 and 14-24 depend variously from these independent claims and are likewise patentable over the asserted combination of references for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections have been addressed. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-24 are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: March 3, 2008
BJH/ERM/ayw